THE REPORTER

VOL. VI, No. 4 | *For Conscience' Sake* | JANUARY, 1949

Flying Heifers

The latest development in heifers for relief is the plan of the Heifer Project Committee to fly heifers by air transports to Venezuela where that government is resettling 50,000 or more European refugees. Shipping costs for the animals furnished by the inter-faith organization will be paid by the Venezuelan Government.

The heifers will be sent to the reception center where 2,000 to 2,500 refugees are given training by agricultural, social and religious advisers to help them adjust to their new homeland. The calves will be assigned to refugee families when they are allocated farm land.

Since the first cattle shipment in July 1944 over 5,000 heifers and bulls have been sent to Puerto Rico, Greece, Mexico, France, Belgium, Poland, Italy, China, Albania, Japan and Austria. A total of 7,409 animals had been shipped up to November 1948. The bulk of the 1948 shipments consisted of goats to Japan and heifers to Italy.

Under CPS 336 assignees served as cattle-boat attendants for heifers shipped by the Heifer Project Committee under the UNRRA program.

Offices of the Heifer Project Committee are located at New Windsor, Maryland.

Draft Violators IV-F

The Selective Service Regulations require that a man be placed in the lowest classification for which he is eligible. In the case of those who violated the 1940 draft act, this is IV-F.

The law provides that, "No insane or intoxicated person, no deserter from the military service of the United States, and no person who has been convicted of a felony shall be enlisted or mustered into the military service; Provided, however, that with relation to deserters and persons convicted of felonies the Secretary of the Army may, by regulations or otherwise, authorize exceptions in special meritorious cases." Title 10, U. S. Code Annotated, Sec. 622. Section 6(m) of the Selective Service Act seems to contain a cross-reference to this quotation; it reads, "No person shall be relieved from training and service under this title by reason of conviction of a criminal offense, except where the offense of which he has been convicted may be punished by death, or by imprisonment for a term exceeding one year." So 10 USCA 622 is still law; and all violators of the 1940 Act are within it, because they were all subject to punishment for as long as five years, regardless of the sentences they actually received.

If a man falls in this group, the appropriate classification is one for being morally deficient or defective, IV-F. If the strict wording of the statute is followed, the classification will not depend on his rejection by the Army, but will be given to him before that, because the Army should not take him under the statute, even if it wants to.

The best information we can obtain indicates that CO's are not meritorious exceptions. To be made an exception one must apply at a recruiting office,

(*Continued on page 3*)

New Executive Secretary

A. Stauffer Curry, Elgin, Illinois, is leaving his position as secretary of the field program for the General Brotherhood Board of the Church of the Brethren and will begin his duties as executive secretary of the National Service Board for Religious Objectors on January 17.

Curry lived his boyhood in Pennsylvanuia, graduating from Elizabethtown College in 1935. The following year he taught school in Lebanon, Pa. From 1936-40 he was pastor of the Westminster Church of the Brethren and also studied in the Westminster Theological Seminary of the Methodist Church, receiving the S.T.B. degree in 1939. In the summer of 1939 he represented the Church of the Brethren at the World Conference of Christian Youth at Amsterdam, Holland. From 1940-45 he served as executive secretary of the Southeastern Regional Council of Boards of the Church of the Brethren. During 1943-45 he also taught in the department of religion and philosophy at Bridgewater College, Va. He received the M.A. degree in psychology from Catholic University, Washington, D. C., in 1945 and then studied at New York University School of Education where he also served as New England secretary of the Fellowship of Reconciliation. From 1946-47 he served as director of field organization for the Brethren Service Commission and later as secretary of field program for the General Brotherhood Board. In 1948 he received the Ph.D. degree in psychology and religious education from New York University.

Belief and Conduct in The 1948 Draft Act

When a registrant is presenting evidence to his draft board in order to obtain a IV-E classification he should consider two things. The regulations require the board to find (1) that he is opposed to combatant assignment or I-A and (2) that he is opposed to noncombatant assignment or I-A-O also. In answering the questions on Form 150, therefore, the registrant should keep these two points distinctly in mind.

In each of these claims what the registrant is trying to prove is his actual state of mind. If the draft board finds that each assertion is the registrant's actual state of mind the Selective Service Act requires that it classify him IV-E.

The most effective evidence of a state of mind may be a written statement by the registrant or else an old statement he wrote at a date when the possibility of a draft seemed more remote. Essays, articles, or talks written to be delivered at school, church, or young people's meetings are the kind of thing that some CO's will have.

Oral statements to individuals or groups, especially those made when the possibility of a draft seemed remote, are also good evidence. The CO may obtain written statements from these people testifying that they heard him. If he is seeking IV-E he should get statements from persons who have heard him express his views against war and I-A-O service. The letters or statements should be addressed to the local board or TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN and should say that the writer has heard the CO express such views and that he believes them to be his beliefs. He might also add how long he has known the CO to acknowledge such beliefs.

It is not necessary that the person agree with the views of the CO. It is even better if he is a veteran or a member of the American Legion or someone who takes an opposite view. Other persons might include his minister, Sunday School or public school teacher, employer, etc.

If the CO is a veteran or has only recently accepted or come to a I-A-O or IV-E position he should explain in what manner his present beliefs differ from his former stand. Letters from other persons should testify how his views have changed.

The registrant may choose to refer to his former oral statements without asking for any written letters. In that case the draft board may call upon the person to whom they were made to verify them or else the Department of Justice may verify them when the case is appealed. The persons whose names he gives should be, of course, those who he believes will testify accurately concerning his beliefs.

(*Continued on page 2*)

THE REPORTER

VOL. VI, No. 4 JANUARY, 1949

Published monthly in the interests of peace, freedom of conscience and related activities.

NATIONAL SERVICE BOARD for RELIGIOUS OBJECTORS

941 Mass. Ave., N. W., Washington 1, D. C.

Subscription price:

Foreign or Domestic, $1.00 per year.

Reformed Church

To the names of church and other organizations listed as members of the Consultative Council in the December REPORTER should be added the Reformed Church in America. The affiliation with the Reformed Church is through its Committee on International Justice and Goodwill. Robert A. Geddes is secretary of the committee with offices at 29 South Highwood Avenue, Glen Rock, N. J.

The Consultative Council of the NSBRO is now composed of 29 such groups.

EVIDENCE—(from page 1)

A general letter of character recommendation by itself is of little value since many people of good character are drafted into the army daily. Such a letter does not show that the man is opposed to war and to army medical or other noncombatant service. If the man writes his own statement on his views a general letter of recommendation may show that he is truthful and support his written statement in that way.

Conduct as Evidence

Conduct may also be evidence of what the registrant's state of mind is but draft board members sometimes have difficulty in drawing sensible conclusions about a state of mind from conduct. If a man attends a church where non-resistance sermons are preached, or seeks the company of other objectors frequently, or demonstrates his belief in constructive living by going to a church work camp then his conduct indicates his state of mind and draft boards probably will have no difficulty with the evidence because the connection between what the man is doing and what he thinks about war has been often explained to them through CO publications. The reason such conduct should be submitted is not because the law requires a man to put his beliefs into practice but simply because it is good evidence to the board of what the man's state of mind really is; oral statements by the registrants may be just as good evidence as attending a church or going to a work camp from the legal point of view. It is entirely a question of evidence as to what the man's beliefs really are and not at all a question of whether he is living up to them. Many church people have come to believe in recent years that practice in religion needs more emphasis and theory less. The draft act goes on the opposite assumption that belief is the important thing and practice might not enter at all if it were not necessary for local boards to have evidence. If the board members find that a man is really a CO they cannot refuse him IV-E because they think that he doesn't spend enough time in Sunday School; his conduct can only be considered by the board for the purpose of finding out whether he actually objects to war because of his belief in a Supreme Being; otherwise the consistency of his beliefs or the question of whether his conduct is consistent with his beliefs should not be considered by the board.

Consistency and Sincerity

This proposition that a draft board cannot explore the consistency of a man's belief but only his sincerity needs more explaining. There are two aspects to the question of a CO's insincerity; there is first the consistency of his various beliefs with each other and there is secondly the consistency of his beliefs with his conduct. To take consistency between a man's various beliefs first—a draft board cannot deny a man IV-E because the *board* thinks his views are inconsistent with each other. The board might ask the man to explain how *he thinks* his views are consistent because obviously if a man admits that his own beliefs are inconsistent that is some evidence that the man is insincere. It is only some evidence; it is not conclusive. Some men would admit that they had never succeeded in achieving perfect consistency even though they were not troubled by small inconsistencies. "Consistency is the hobgoblin of little minds." Some people have this capacity for sincere views even though they do not try too hard to work out some general theory that ties together all of their beliefs. A man might therefore admit that he has some inconsistency in his views without showing any evidence of insincerity and a draft board can ask him whether *he thinks* his own views are consistent because that does have enough bearing on sincerity to justify their inquiry. But the board can only investigate consistency insofar as it has some connection with sincerity; they cannot consider consistency in and of itself. Therefore, since sincerity is entirely a question of what the registrant *thinks*—his actual state of mind—consistency is only important insofar as the registrant *thinks* he is consistent. If the registrant thinks he is consistent in his beliefs that is evidence of sincerity and whether the board thinks he is consistent has nothing to do with it. Therefore it is perfectly proper for question No. 6 on SSS Form No. 150 to ask the *registrant* to show how his views are consistent but that does not mean that the draft board is free to decide whether his conduct is consistent according to the boards' notion of consistency. The entire purpose of the question must be to find out whether the man *thinks* himself consistent because that is some indication of sincerity. Throughout the procedure the board cannot enforce its moral code on the man; it can only investigate his mental processes to find out if his statements are genuine.

A good CO court case demonstrating this is the case of U. S. ex rel. *Reel vs. Badt.* In that case a man had been put in IA partly because he had done some legal work in connection with hours and wages of people working in war plants and he was an expert on war contracts. The court said that it was possible for a man to take such a job feeling that so long as he preserved his own integrity by not fighting he was under no compulsion to prevent other people from fighting if they wanted to. A man might be more concerned with his own integrity than with reforming the human race. Therefore, so long as it was possible for a CO to feel that this was consistent the court was satisfied that he was sincere; the fact that the Government thought his conduct inconsistent as a matter of fact had no significance on the question of sincerity.

Similar principles apply in considering whether a man's conduct is consistent with his views. Every individual's conduct will in some way fall short of his opinions and if a draft board were permitted to deny a man the exemption given by the Selective Service Act because of some inconsistency in his conduct no human being would ever qualify. The boards can investigate a man's conduct insofar as it shows what he actually believes about war but after the board has decided a man is a sincere IV-E it cannot deny him that classification because it thinks he is not living up to his beliefs.

Examples of Conduct

Since boards frequently become confused on this point of relating a man's conduct to his state of mind it is probable that the registrant will sometimes have to refute interpretations that the board arrives at from his conduct more often than he will have to refute written or oral statements against him from outsiders. Here are some examples of things a registrant should not let pass. A man has been switching from one church to another; his restless changing has made it impossible for him to do extensive work with any church. The question is what does that prove about his state of mind. A draft board might decide that it proves he has never made up his mind about religion and about being a CO. The registrant should reply to this and not just let it pass. This is evidence that his soul is on a restless search for a church that suits his views and shows how serious his state of mind on the CO question really is. The draft act doesn't require the registrant to go to any church or even to be a Christian; the things it does require is the actual CO belief and the church attendance is only brought in where it proves or disproves something about that belief as in this case.

Another example of a case which might require the man to do some refuting is this: a CO operates a pin-ball machine business; none of the machines are used for gambling purposes. A draft board might decide that he is taking advantage of people, taking advantage of a weakness in human nature to make his living and so conclude that he is possibly also taking advantage of the

(*Continued on page 4*)

The Basis of Jewish Pacificism

By STEVEN S. SCHWARZSCHILD

[Editors Note: Sixty conscientious objectors in CPS were members of the Jewish faith. The author of the following article is a student in the Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, Ohio (a theological training school) and is a member of the Jewish Peace Fellowship.]

Judaism is not an historic peace-church. The aim of Jewish pacifists is, therefore, to separate the strand of pacifism inherent in Jewish tradition from the many other strands with which it is interwoven and to persuade their co-religionists to concede a dominant, normative function to it in their religious way of life. Their endeavor is thus Jewish not only because it is pursued by and for Jews but chiefly because it is the result of the conviction that pacifism is the necessary conclusion of the long evolution of Jewish religious thought and the grand consummation of many centuries of Jewish historical living. They hold that Jewish pacifism is not a doctrine borrowed from any foreign outlook on life, however worthy that may be, but the logical outcome of the internal dynamic of Jewish thought and life. Even as the later (talmudic) law was a self-propelled development and application of prophetic teachings, so pacifism is the conscious crystallization of the lessons of four millenia of Jewish growth.

In both major schools of contemporary Jewish thinking a strong trend of pacifism is perceptible. Though they differ widely in their views on many other problems, Zionist and anti-Zionist theologians both derive their pacifism from their respective interpretations of the fundamental Jewish doctrine of the character of Israel as the chosen people and of the mission of Israel among the nations which is its corollary. The concept of the chosen people is traditionally defined as a people selected for a task rather than a privilege, by grace rather than on merit. According to anti-Zionist theology, the task for which the chosen people is selected to take upon itself the burden of living under such conditions as to make the waging of war and the practice of violence an historical impossibility. The dispersion of Jews throughout the world provides these conditions, since the lack of country makes an army unnecessary, the lack of geographical concentration makes its organization unfeasible, and living essentially as a minority implies the necessity of peaceful, cooperative and open-minded living. Zionist theology, on the other hand, regards the construction of a peaceful and socialist society through a religious transformation of its members as the pioneering task of the chosen people. These two versions of Jewish pacifism are best expressed in philosophy by Hermann Cohen and Martin Buber, in literature by Zweig's "Jeremiah" and Beer-Hofmann's "Jacob's Dream."

In the experience of all the crucial hours of actual Jewish history, the impact of religious considerations redirected initial violent reactions into pacifist channels. Already in the Babylonian war Jeremiah realized to the discomfort of his people that the adversary was the "rod of God," that as such he could receive his punshment only from God, but that the Jewish people would have to take its punshment from him. Out of this experience arose Isaiah's recognition of the place of suffering in the economy of God's kingdom. Finally perhaps the most decisive turn in the course of Jewish history, the creation and rise to power of the Pharisaic party, resulted from a twofold pacifist opposition; firstly an organized, religious protest against the secular, imperialist, military adventures of the Hasmonean dynasty, and secondly, the conviction that Judaism could be saved, nay even advanced, in the face of the overwhelming power of the Roman empire not by physical force but only by lifting it to such a spiritual level that it could no longer be affected by the weapons of its enemies. Through this consciously pacifist transformation at the hands of some of the early talmudic rabbis, the phoenix of Judaism arose more colorfully than ever out of the ruins of the Temple of Jerusalem. Yet neither prophet nor rabbi ever confused pacifism with passivism; to the contrary, the more violence was abjured the more value was placed upon positive, moral action as the Jewish road of approach toward the kingdom of God.

Contemporary Jewish pacifism attempts to refashion the Judaism of today even as the talmudic rabbis refashioned the Judaism of their day, using the methods which they used and which are given by Judaism itself for its own refashioning. This process requires two steps: 1. A clear recogntion of the direction in which Judaism has developed up to a given point in time, and 2, the furtherance of this development in the same direction beyond this point, as far as possible by means of liberalization through interpretation. An outstanding example of this procedure which also bears a direct relationship to pacifism is the change which the institution of capital punshment underwent at the hands of the talmudic rabbis. It could not be denied that legal execution was an integral part of the juridical canon of the Bible. Yet the tendency of the Bible, in spirit, seemed to be better manifested in the prohibition to use iron in the construction of the altar, because iron is the tool of violence, than in the institution of capital punishment. With the aim of advancing this tendency, yet unable to abrogate a positive biblical enactment, the rabbis so increased the conditions which would have to be fulfilled before the death-penalty could be imposed that it was in practice abolished. "A court which condemns to death more than once in seventy years is itself worthy of death." After two thousand years of continued progress along the same line, Judaism seems to its pacifist interpreters ready to say today: a court which condemns to death at all is transcending its powers!

But not only by criteria of the past, the tendencies of past development, also by criteria of the ultimate future envisaged by Judaism do Jewish pacifists derive their Jewish sanctions for pacifism. The prophetic visions of the end-of-days invariably included the messianic establishment of universal peace and amity. When perhaps the greatest modern Jewish philisopher, Hermann Cohen, defined truth not so much as the knowledge of what is but rather of what shall be, he was not only a neo-Kantian but also in the best spirit of Judaism. Messianic peace now is the final truth of Judaism. Unlike standard Jewish orthodoxy, Jewish pacifists believe that this end must determine the means toward it, as does every end. Thus the perfect peace of the kingdom of God can be brought about only by the methods of operation of the kingdom of God. This truth was expressed by Rabbi Leo Baeck, the valiant and revered leader of German Jewry in its recent cruel trial, in the memorable pacifist declaration: "The ideal of peace may not remain a mere pious hope and yearning for the future and thus the mere object of a mood; it may never remain mere music and edification, so that we might go and elevate ourselves and become intoxicated with peace. The ideal of peace becomes a religious ideal only when it tells man irrefusably what God commands him to do today and tomorrow and forever for the sake of peace. The religious peace-task is the labor and the toil which begin peace with the near, so that men can walk the road toward the peace of the far."

These firm and dignified, yet mild and warm words first spoken as a Jewish answer to the well-nigh unbearable challenge of Hitler's Germany are today being repeated by Chaim Weizmann in the face of great provocation in Palestine; they are being taught by the wise president of the University of Jerusalem, Judah Magnes, and its professor of social philosophy, Martin Buber. They were pronounced and practiced by young American Jews during the last war who have organized themselves in the Jewish Peace Fellowship. They will yet be sounded from the pulpits and pews of all synagogues, the eternal cry of Israel: "And it shall come to pass in the end of days, many peoples shall go and say: Come ye and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, to the house of God of Jacob. And they shall beat their swords into plowshares and their spears into pruning-hooks. Nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war anymore."

VIOLATORS—(from page 1)

from which his case will be forwarded to the Secretary of the Army, or else he can apply direct. If the draft board were to apply for the registrant, but the registrant himself refused, it does not seem that he could be justly called meritorious.

By taking a IV-F classification, the registrant does not injure his claim for IV-E later on, if he is subsequently removed from IV-F.

Since we have so far not heard of a registrant being given IV-F because of his former felony, it seems likely that draft boards do not know of this requirement and it should be pointed out to them as an alternative wherever the facts justify it.

From the Papers

From an editorial in the St. Paul, Minnesota, Pioneer-Press:

A 23-year-old University of Minnesota student has been sentenced to eight months in a federal penal institution for failure to register for the draft. He is paying a high price for a bit of needless exhibtionism. The young man had served 30 months as a combat infantryman. As a war veteran, he would never have been drafted. All that was required of him was compliance with the law in going through the motions of having his name registered.

The Minnesota boy chose to make his protest against the revival of peacetime conscription a publicized issue by refusing to register and then inviting, if not defying, the authorities to do something about it. Obviously, there was only one thing authorities could do, and that was to enforce the law.

No one felt that there was anything particularly pleasant about revival of the draft. But our minimum essentials as to armed strength in the interest of the nation's own defenses and in the carrying out of its solemn commitments in sharing military occupation burdens in conquered territory were not being met by voluntary enlistments. The only way of keeping up the necessary level was to impose conscription.

Over-dramatized protest against the draft by a man whom it did not directly affect was about as ridiculous a performance as that of the young American, completing military service, who renounced his citizenship while in Paris to become a "citizen of the world" by installing himself, bedroll and all, on territory being used by the United Nations for a General Assembly session.

These young Don Quixotes have had their fleeting day in the public prints, but the traditions of democratic society remain unchanged. One of them is that of following properly prescribed rules, whether we like them or not. And even the process of changing those rules must follow the unsensational and difficult course of first convincing others that it should be done.

By Robert C. Ruark, Scripps Howard columnist:

I quarrel with the verdict of Federal Judge Harold Medina, who just hit a draft-dodger with a year and a day, with the hint that if he came back to court repentant before a certain date the sentence might lighten. To my mind, the judge should have thrown the book.

I know something about this particular rugged individualist, who served 19 months in jail during the last war for refusal to report for induction. His name is Sander Katz, and he is one of the long-hairs who stroll the Village streets, lost in reveries and a turtle-neck sweater. He has scruples against the draft act, but no scruples against the enjoyment of living in an intact country, made possible by a draft act.

Mr. Katz, if inducted, would be utterly useless as a soldier, and would undoubtedly receive a Section 8, which would loose him swiftly on the streets of Bohemia. It is my point, though that he should be given the chance to qualify for his psychiatric discharge, or else you have no law. Or, on refusal to comply, he might be sentenced to double the time of the existing draft enrollment—42 months.

No matter what you think of a draft, especially in peace, it is law for the nation and a great many fine young men will be ripped untimely from their personal pursuit of happiness of take part in same. The predraft volunteers will serve a minimum of 18 months. The draftnees will serve 21. Mr. Katz, if unpardoned, serves 12 months.

I was talking the other day, to a young man with sad eyes—eyes which grew somber because he bestowed about three years on Johnston, Canton and Palmyra islands. This boy pulled a year and a quarter on Canton Island alone. No solitary cell can be much worse than Canton Island—a grim pimple of treeless land in the middle of the Pacific.

While this guy was sweating out a confinement easily comparable to a prison, young Katz spent a quiet 19 months in a stateside brig. Katz had a deal for himself. And I might add that he'd be eligible for draft exemption today if he had conformed to a national demand that caught up all the splendid youth presently planted at Anzio and Tarawa.

A peacetime draft is a specifically awful thing—pointless to the individual, if there is to be no war, irksome at best, and superfluous if the war really comes, since its blueprint will be speedily scrapped in favor of a plan embracing everybody, including veterans. But it has been deemed by Congress as a necessary measure to security, and is shaped for universal application. As the law of the best surviving nation it supposedly owes no special exemptions, even to people whose high moral principles condemn it as evil.

I am sick of the dissenters who enjoy the benefits and refuse the penalties of living in this particular land. So long as we operate by duly-passed law, the punishment for nonconformation should be bitter and ample—ample to the point of dramatic emphasis. It has been doubly difficult to sell this current draft legislation to the nation—it will become more difficult if the wilful dodgers escape with a slap on the pinky.

From a letter in the New York World-Telegram:

Robert Ruark in his November 25 column advocates harsh treatment for those men who refuse to cooperate with the draft law. He specifically protests the sentence of a year and a day for Sander Katz, a non-registrant in New York.

Mr. Ruark seems to be saying that because the draft law is pointless, irksome, and superfluous everybody should be made to suffer under it without exception. Sander Katz would probably agree with Mr. Ruark as to the pointlessness of the draft, but he goes even further by holding that a conscription law is a basic denial of human personality and freedom.

Mr. Ruark says he is sick of the dissenters who enjoy the benefits and refuse the penalties of living in this particular land. Katz may enjoy the benefits, but he has certainly also taken the penalties: at the age of 24 he is serving his second sentence in a federal prison as a felon because he has refused to be conscripted to be trained in the art of modern murder.

If Mr. Ruark will re-examine the action and motivation of those who openly refuse to comply with conscription (who do not dodge the issue, as Mr. Ruark implies with his term "draft dodger"), he will find that they are concerned with freedom in their own country as well as throughout the world, that they agree with the principle (but not the way in which it was used) that the United States, along with the Allied governments laid down at the Nuremberg and Tokyo war crimes trials; that men are morally responsible for their actions and that they should refuse to obey the orders of the state whether those orders will lead to crime against humanity.—ROY C. KEPLER, *War Resisters League.*

EVIDENCE—(from page 2)

draft board when he applies for IV-E and that he might even be in favor of a war so long as he doesn't have to wear a uniform. This person should point out to his board his refusal to gamble. If he were in the hardware business and refused to gamble it would mean very little since there is small temptation there but if he refuses to gamble in the pin-ball machine business that is exceptionally strong evidence that he is the type of person who does have scruples and who thinks about the right and wrong of whatever he is doing and that is evidence that he is probably telling the truth about his beliefs on war. It is not the business of the board to inquire whether a CO who operates such machines is being consistent in his conduct; the board should only ask what it shows about his beliefs with regard to war.

The registrant who has the job of refuting some interpretation his board has put on his conduct should point out to his board that it is their business to examine his sincerity, not his consistency and he should put the correct interpretation of his conduct in his file in writing.